THE WAR WITH MEXICO.

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY S. FOOTE, OF MISSISSIPPI,

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, JANUARY 19 & 20, 1848,

On the Bill reported from the Committee on Military Affairs to raise, for a limited time, an additional Military Force.

Mr. FOOTE said: The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BADGER] concluded his speech of yesterday with the mention of what he was pleased to entitle "the flickering light of military glory." What does this mean? Does he so much condemn the war, that he is of opinion, with some other distinguished gentlemen of his party, that no permanent honor can be acquired in a war so unjust and unconstitutional? I knew before that the venerable Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEBSTER] had expressed, some months ago, his opinion, in very plain language too, that no real glory could be achieved in such a war. His words on this point are worth quotation; for they seem to me to indicate a settled design, not to say a deliberate conspiracy, in certain quarters, to prevent our military chieftains of this Mexican war from deriving any eminent civic advancement from their immortal exploits. "Sir," said the Senator from Massachusetts, on the occasion referred to, "I need 'not say that I have as much respect for distin-'guished military achievement as any man. I 'would not see any laurels that belonged to it 'withered. I honor those who are called on, by 'professional duty, to bear arms in their country's 'cause, and who do their duty well. I would ob-'scure none of their fame. But I will say here, 'and to them, that it is the solemn adjudication of 'nations, and it is the sentiment of the Christian 'world, that war waged for vicious purposes, or 'from vicious motives, tarnishes the lustre of arms, 'and darkens, if it does not blot, what other-'wise might be a glorious page in the history of 'the nation that makes it." Well, sir, the Senator from North Carolina, and others coöperating with him in this discussion, claim to have proved that this war was entered upon by the President, not in defence, nor to avenge national injuries and insults, but in order to secure a plausible pretext for forcibly seizing upon, and permanently retaining, the Californias and New Mexico. He denounces the act as a great crime, and quotes poetry depictive of his contempt and indignation against such vile conduct; so that between the two distinguished gentlemen, the case is easily made out. Neither General Taylor nor General Scott could have gained any laurels worthy to adorn the brow of a patriot, since the war is judged to be both waged for "vicious purposes" and from "vicious motives," and thus is "the lustre of arms" seriously "tarnished." This, too, is not mentioned to be the opinion of a single individual, however distinguished, nor even of many; but "the adjudication of nations," and "the sentiment of the Christian world." No wonder that the Senator from North Carolina talks about the flickering light of military glory. This word *flickering* is quite expressive. It is usually applied to the blaze of a candle or lamp just in the act of becoming extinct. And, sir, is it possible that all the glory which certain gentlemen lately saw in the achievements of our brave officers and men who have fought in Mexico, is about becoming eclipsed? Shall we say of the lustre of Buena Vista, "*Sic transit gloria mundi?*" Has the old dread of military chieftains suddenly come upon distinguished gentlemen? Is Cicero's famous maxim—"*Arma cedunt togæ*"—about to be realized? Has some magnetic process been going on, in order to win distinguished gentlemen back to their old faith, and prevent them from running after new idols? I have understood that the celebrated lecturer on electro-magnetism is in the city, and, if applied to, might perchance suggest the means of succeeding in this magnetizing scheme. Well, I am really afraid that if the blaze of military glory is flickering, it may be expected to go out shortly.

Mr. BADGER. If the Senator will allow me to interrupt him, I will say that the expression which I used was used inadvertently. The term I intended to use was very different. I meant the dazzling light of military glory. I was not aware, until the Senator informed me, that I had used the word *flickering*.

Mr. FOOTE. Well, sir, dazzling is the word, then. I am not sure that this helps the case much. If the glory of arms is dazzling, why then we infer that there is nothing substantial in it, but it is altogether delusive. Sir, it is not my business to advocate the claims of military men to high civil stations on account of their military distinction alone. Nor shall I seriously interfere in this matter at all; but whether General Taylor's glory, as one of the officers in this war, be or be not either flickering or dazzling—fading into extinction, or merely delusory—I feel bound to say a few words in vindication of this commander, against the peculiar advocacy which the Senator from North Carolina has thought proper, on the present occasion, to originate in his behalf. He asserts that the movement of General Taylor to the Rio Grande brought on the war; and he further says that Gen-

Printed at the Congressional Globe Office.

eral Taylor is not at all responsible for this movement. Indeed! General Taylor not responsible? Why, it is one of his chief glories in the war that he is responsible. The movement was necessary; he perceived the necessity of approaching the Rio Grande—did advance to it—and lo! the collision of arms. The whole correspondence of General Taylor with the Government is of the same import, and is all alike calculated to fix upon him the chief responsibility of the movement, and secure to him the glory of having acted with singular acuteness, energy, and good sense, at this delicate crisis.

[Here Mr. F. read from various documents, in maintenance of what he had asserted, and then proceeded as follows:]

Sir, no man can examine this correspondence between General Taylor and the Secretary of War, without being perfectly satisfied of these facts: 1st. That the Administration entirely confided in his judgment and energy, and designed from the first to endow him with an ample discretion as to his movements on the southwestern frontier. 2d. That every movement in the direction of the Rio Grande was taken, either upon his own judgment, in the absence of special instructions from Washington, or in obedience to instructions founded upon his own previous advice; and 3d. That there was not one of these movements, from first to last—from the location of his troops on the west bank of the Nueces, up to the earliest battle with the enemy—which he did not execute with great alacrity, and, as there is good reason to believe, with a full conviction that what he was doing was necessary to the honor of his country, and to his own personal fame. And now, when the glorious battles of Palo Alto, Resaca de la Palma, Monterey, and Buena Vista have been fought; when General Taylor's fame and popularity are placed beyond question, by his conduct upon those immortal fields of bloody and perilous strife, I must regard it as one of the most illiberal, unfair, and, but for the respect which I bear certain gentlemen here, I would say unmanly and contemptible efforts I have ever heard of in my life to shuffle him, by sly device and quibbling sophistry, out of all the responsibility of those acts, without which he would never have been, as he is, his country's pride and the world's admiration. Sir, so decided are my opinions on this subject, that, as much as I admire General Taylor, (and I do so as highly as any one in the Republic, out of the pale of those who are struggling to make political capital out of his popularity,) so help me Heaven, if I thought, as I am far from doing, that he would give his sanction, for an instant of time, to such miserable special pleading as we have heard here from his professed friends, I should feel compelled to give up entirely my present profound respect for his character as a man of justice and magnanimity. I will not believe, sir, that were General Taylor now in our midst, he would fail to set gentlemen right on this subject; and I confidently believe that he would tell them that he scorns all popularity or character which is to be obtained by a resort to technical subterfuges, that would not be very respectable even in a justice's court, in a case where the whole matter in controversy only amounted to some fifteen shillings or less. I am almost tempted to exclaim, in the language of Falstaff—

"Call you this backing your friends?"

Sir, it seems to me, that in the progress of the debate which has been going on for some days past in this body, not a small number of the topics which have been introduced, and more or less strenuously urged upon our attention, have either no legitimate connection with the grave and momentous question before us, or have been heretofore so repeatedly discussed in legislative halls, and in popular assemblies, that but little either of profit or entertainment could be reasonably anticipated from a renewed examination of them at the present time. I may be in error, sir; but if I do not egregiously mistake the indications of public sentiment which are reaching us every hour, there has never been more unanimity exhibited in this country than is now displaying itself in regard to the origin, progress, and future prosecution of the pending war with Mexico. Sir, the patriotic citizens of this Republic, almost everywhere, heartily approve the whole course of the Administration thus far in the management of this war, and are resolved that it shall not languish for want of the necessary supplies, both of men and money, to ensure its vigorous prosecution. Thank Heaven, we have not yet reached—and God forbid we should ever reach—that sad period in our history as a free people, when a factious combination anywhere will be able to plunge the natal land of Washington and Jackson, of Jefferson and Franklin, into that deep and irretrievable disgrace which I fear that a few degenerate sons of heroic sires in different parts of the Republic have been, for some months past, laboring most assiduously to provide for us. Not yet—nor ever, I trust—are we to realize those scenes so memorable in Athenian annals, when Demosthenes, whose fervent and fearless eloquence shook even the Macedonian despot upon his throne, felt constrained, by a high sense of patriotic duty, to launch the arrows of his blasting invective against certain factious orators of his day; who, swayed by party feeling or the mad ambition to rule, or some motive still more inglorious, sought to get up a party in Athens opposed to timely measures of defence against the dangerous encroachments of Philip. Far from us, and from our posterity, be that moment of disgrace and desperation, when an American Senator shall find it necessary to the freedom and honor of his country to denounce any portion of his countrymen in such language as burst in lightning and in thunder from the lips of the noblest champion of Grecian liberty, when he exclaimed—

"But not only is our full conviction of these facts necessary to our safety—not only is it necessary that we should resolve to take vengeance on Philip by all the operations of war,—but it is equally necessary that we should prosecute, with the most determined hatred, those who make harangues in his favor. Let us be strongly convinced how impossible it is to vanquish the foreign enemies of the republic, until we punish her domestic foes—these ministers of Philip. But I appeal to Jupiter, and all our other gods, you have neither power for such an attempt, nor inclination. For to such excess are you arrived, either of infatuation or phrensy, (I am unable to express myself,) that I am frequently alarmed lest some demon precipitately hurry the republic to destruction; when, either for the sake of some personal invective or invidious remark, some malignant ridicule or trivial pleasantry, you command those mercenaries of Philip to speak in your assemblies, and laugh when they are scurrilously abusive. Nor is this the severest mischief, however severe; for you have, at least in part, given up the republic to their administration, and rendered it less dangerous for them to offer you the most pernicious measures, than for others to propose that counsel which concerns your interests and honor alone."

No one, Mr. President, who listened to the able

argument of the Senator from Maryland, a few days since, could have avoided being forciby struck with the peculiar cogency of that part of it which was devoted to establishing the important position, that the pending war with Mexico is both just and honorable. Perhaps I should have been still more impressed with the views of the Senator from Maryland, had I not been led, from his high reputation as a jurist and a statesman, to anticipate such an effort as would comport with the peculiar dignity of his own chivalrous State, and be not unworthy of the successor in this body of the first of American orators—the illustrious Pinkney. I fear, though, that the logical artillery of the honorable Senator was hardly felt to play with any decided effect upon the convictions of those most proximate to him in this Chamber; among whom, if he shall, perchance, have effected a conversion or two, I shall regard it as matter of special gratulation. But, whatever fortune the Senator may have had in this respect, such an argument as he has presented here will certainly not fail to receive a just appreciation at the hands of his countrymen; and the day can never by possibility arrive when he will regret the expression of views at once so wise and so noble. Ever will the "star-spangled banner" of our fathers wave in triumph "over the land of the free and the home of the brave," whilst sentiments of lofty patriotism in our national councils shall attend upon the valorous achievements of our heroic armies upon the fields of a just and defensive war.

The speech of the Senator from Maryland, so far as it was in vindication of the justice and honor of the war, could scarcely have failed of its intended effect in any quarter, as it would seem to me, except where compelled to encounter that great enemy to truth, against which the venerable Senator from South Carolina, the other day, so solemnly warned us, and which he was pleased to denominate "pride of opinion." When this pride of opinion was thus, with something of dramatic emphasis, exorcised by the distinguished Senator from the noble Palmetto State, I confess that I scarcely knew precisely what quality of the mental man might be probably alluded to. But I have since ascertained, from some who profess to be particularly wise in such matters, that this same pride of opinion is a morbid condition of the human intellect, brought on, most commonly at least, in understandings of a certain elevation and expansive force, by multiplied successes achieved over vigorous opponents in the arena of logical digladiation—that it is a *status* of moral being very much disrelished by those who are over-eager to make proselytes either in religion or politics, and of which those are apt to complain most dolorously when they suspect its existence in others, who, in the impartial judgment of mankind in general, are most subject to the access of the malady themselves. Now, as pride of opinion is commonly understood to be precisely "antagonistical" to what is known among practical politicians under the dread name of inconsistency, (which latter quality is quite celebrated as a grievous impediment to high civic advancement,) I am not entirely able to perceive why it might not be permitted to escape severe criticism on this side of the Atlantic, where most of our leading statesmen, unmindful of illustrious examples elsewhere, of the formal and public disavowal of opinions once ascertained to be clearly erroneous, are every now and then heard to insist, with an earnestness which is the customary attendant of perfect sincerity of heart, that though it may be quite possible for the wondrous magnet to lose more or less of its characteristic polarity, and for Phœbus himself, some of these cold and cloudy days, in a moment of sudden caprice, perchance, to permit the regular succession of the seasons to become fatally disturbed, yet that the operative powers of their minds are not at all subject to the great law of change which is impressed upon the whole universe besides, and that they have the happiness still, in the noon or evening of life, as the case may be, to entertain the self-same opinions upon all the public questions which have divided parties in this their day and generation, which they adopted upon their first entrance into the tangled and thorny pathways of modern statesmanship.

Mr. President, the learned and able Senator from Maryland has made it wholly unnecessary that the Administration now in power should be hereafter defended against a number of charges growing out of this Mexican war. Did I not know that the course of that Senator had not been at all actuated by a desire to conciliate the political party with which it is my honor to hold connection, I should thank him, in the name of those associated with me, for the seasonable and effectual relief which he has thus afforded us, and which his conscience and patriotism have forced him to afford us, from the insidious and persevering hostility of an unscrupulous press, sustained and encouraged as it is by a furious band of unblushing demagogues, who occupy themselves night and day in traducing the Government of their own country, and in bewailing the wrongs and sufferings of those whom they denominate "our republican brethren in Mexico." Had a friend of the ruling Administration, however elevated in point of character, and energetic in the field of debate, given utterance to many of the striking and important truths so startlingly announced by the Senator from Maryland, there is reason to believe that the work of conviction would have scarcely been consummated in the minds of many deluded citizens, who will now see that to doubt the justice and honor of this war, and all the minor points involved in this sweeping proposition, is to stultify their own understandings, and to close their hearts to all the ennobling sentiments which swell and animate the bosom of the patriot. Who will ever be unblushing enough hereafter to deny the honor and justice of this war? Who will hereafter deny that the Rio Grande was the boundary line of Texas before annexation, and of our country since? Who will dare to call in question the authority or policy of marching our army to the left bank of this now famous river? Who will doubt the previous determination of the Mexican Government, as promulged in grave public documents, to carry on a cruel and devastating war upon all our peaceful citizens who might, at the period of intended invasion, be found west of the Sabine? Who will not now perceive that a large military force had been already concentrated in the neighborhood of Matamoros, which was almost ready to light up the flames of war along our whole frontier, before the movement of our heroic army from the west bank of the Nueces? Thus might I have indulged in the language of interrogation a few days ago. Alas! we

can do so no longer. Several gentlemen, standing high with their party, and of deservedly respectable rank in a learned profession, have lately attempted to put the country afloat again upon the ocean of disputation. But I trust they will forgive me for saying, what I think all, save themselves, must have most sensibly felt, that I could not perceive anything which fell from either of them at all calculated to weaken the force of the argument of the Senator from Maryland, as to any of the points discussed by him. These, I proclaim, so far as partisan opposition is concerned, are settled points; in the language of the law-books, *res adjudicata.* The arena of controversy, as to all these questions heretofore so fiercely disputed, should be regarded as being now forever closed; and, according to the Senator from Maryland, the President is only to blame for not having caused a larger force to march under command of General Taylor than that distinguished officer saw assembled around him upon the battle-fields of Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma. So that the President was not censurable for ordering the march to the Rio Grande, but for not discovering the intention of the enemy still earlier than he did, and for failing to assemble a sufficient body of men under the standard of our country, to have at once demoralized the foe, and have caused him to abandon his hostile design forever. I am persuaded, that if the Senator had looked into this matter somewhat more carefully, he would have ascertained that there was as little ground for condemning the Executive on this score, as for ordering the march to the Rio Grande; as it is at least certain, beyond contradiction, that General Taylor had full authority to procure the increase of his army to any extent which he might judge necessary; and that though he had but a small force, in point of numbers, to contend with the large army at the moment known to be concentrating upon the Rio Grande, yet his army was just as large as he desired it to be, or supposed to be at all necessary, and that he had been seasonably given the power to increase his force according to his discretion. How the admission of the Senator from Maryland, as to the justice and honor of the war, can be made to harmonize with a position afterwards taken by him, that though Mexico was entirely to blame, yet that the President is to blame also; and that it was the duty of the President, though commander-in-chief of our army, and bound, by his oath of office as such, first to consult Congress before he sent a single order to our commander at Corpus Christi, directing him, in accordance with his own views of propriety, as antecedently expressed to the Government, to place the troops under his command in an attitude which might enable them to defend the soil of our country from threatened invasion—I shall leave to the Senator himself and the country to determine. I shall not debate this point; a discussion of it, as it strikes me, would be wholly profitless; and I was too highly gratified with nearly all that fell from that distinguished gentleman, to seek controversy with him upon subordinate questions. I would rather believe that any apparent inconsistency in the views of the Senator from Maryland arose from haste and inadvertence—from a natural unwillingness to part company altogether with those who have been heretofore his political associates; or from a disposition, sometimes evinced by legal gentlemen, to show to those around with how much skill and adroitness they are able "to confute, change hands, and still confute." Instead of censuring the Senator from Maryland for what may have appeared to some to savor somewhat of illiberality and unfairness, I would prefer saying, that whilst the distinguished Senator was speaking, I observed the tempestuous excitement which he was awakening around him; and discerning in countenances wont to be serene, the signs of rising wrath, I could not help recurring to that scene of elemental conflict, so vividly portrayed by a poet of our times, when he exclaims:

"The sky is changed! and such a change! oh night!
And storm, and darkness, ye are wondrous strong, yet lovely in your strength,
As is the light of a dark eye in woman! Far along,
From peak to peak the rattling crags among,
Leaps the live thunder! Not from one lone cloud,
But every mountain now hath found a tongue;
And Jura answers from *his* misty shroud
Back to the joyous Alps, who call to him aloud."

And pursuing the description a little further, I would beg leave to say of the Senator from Maryland:

"Now where the quick Rhone thus hath cleft his way,
The mightiest of the storms has ta'en his stand:
For here not one, but many make their play,
And fling their thunderbolts from hand to hand,
Flashing and cast around: of all the band,
The brightest through these *parted* hills hath *forked*
His lightnings—as if he did understand,
That in such gaps as desolation worked,
There the hot shaft should blast whatever therein lurked."

Sir, the President has been much complained of in this discussion for having suggested, in his second annual message, that "aid and comfort" had been imparted to Mexico in this war by a few persons in this country, who are exerting a zealous opposition to the further prosecution of hostilities. I deem this complaint wholly unfounded, and will endeavor to demonstrate it to be so.

Sir, in this age of cultivated reason, which may be emphatically called the age of moral influences, when the mind of man is every day achieving new victories, more brilliant and decisive than the old, over the serious impediments of various kinds which have heretofore obstructed its progress along the pathways of knowledge—when the matured thoughts of gifted and powerful minds, upon subjects both practical and speculative, by means of innumerable printed volumes, the newspaper press, periodicals, literary and scientific, convenient mail arrangements, steamboats, and other vessels of great celerity of motion upon the water, railways and the electric telegraph upon the land, are communicated almost with the rapidity of lightning from the closets of the learned to the toiling millions of all civilized countries under the sun—when arguments, and statements of facts, and the beautiful embellishments of poetic fancy, and the dazzling and overwhelming influence of inflammatory eloquence, are constantly finding their way to the palaces of the great and the cottages of the humble, penetrating towns, and villages, and country places, and reaching even the most retired nooks and corners of social existence—dreadful, oh! dreadful, is the responsibility, both to God and man, of him who perverts truth, or propagates falsehood, or sophisticates for the delusion of the masses, or shows a reckless disregard of the consequences likely to be produced in the minds and conduct of others, by what he either utters as a public speaker, or throws upon paper for more extensive dissemination.

There are distinguished statesmen in this country, whose speeches and letters are read with attention, and are known to wield an influence not inconsiderable among all nations where the art of printing has been introduced, and with which we have heretofore established relations of commercial intercourse. Some of these personages have been at one time members of this body; some are, perchance, bustling and noisy politicians still, who delight in frequenting the thoroughfares of social life, and in keeping their political friends in remembrance of their own peculiar merits. But there is still another class of American great men, whose opinions are interesting to the world: I allude now to the Nestors or Methuselahs of party; a few of whom have retreated long since to the calmer walks of private life, but who still, through some dim loophole of "philosophic retiracy," occupy themselves alternately in watching the ominous and exciting fluctuations of the stock-market, or in spying out the "signs" in the political or financial sky; and who are heard, ever and anon, to whisper to themselves, and a few infatuated and interested votaries around them, with something perchance of doting dignity and Delphic solemnity of manner commingled: "*Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas.*" There are others, perhaps wiser still, who have chosen to bury themselves in rural solitude—absorbed, it may be, in the comfortable and more primeval business of tending herds, and "mending fences," raising for market far other "stock" than that which is known familiarly on 'Change; who talk eloquently of bullocks or "virgin heifers," on holyday occasions; and who, every now and then, are seen emerging from their dearly-prized places of repose, in order once more, if they can, to seize the direction of the understandings and sensibilities of their countrymen. Some of these personages—unmindful of the example of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who, when the Oregon question was under discussion in this body, for some days, and perhaps weeks, refused positively to enter into the debate then in progress, and finally declared, in most emphatic terms, the obligation which he felt to be resting on his conscience, whilst the title of his country to territorial domain was undergoing diplomatic discussion, not to breathe a single syllable calling that title in question—have not hesitated, in this war with Mexico, when questions much more important than claims to disputed territory were pending between the two countries; when millions of money and the most precious blood of the nation were all placed at hazard upon the issue of arms; when national honor and individual fame were both in a condition to be dangerously affected by imprudent and mischievous speaking and acting,—to arrange, in the most ostentatious manner, for the fulmination of fierce and fervid harangues, denunciatory of their own country, and commendatory of the enemy; at a moment, and under such circumstances, too, as must have made known to themselves, in advance, the material fact, that almost as soon as their speeches should be delivered, they would be read in the United States, and thus serve to dispirit their own countrymen, and indispose them, more or less, for the hard service of the tented field; would circulate in Mexico, and encourage the enemy to renewed hostilities; would be republished across the Atlantic, and come back with a rebound from foreign shores, to multiply the original effect, both here and in Mexico. These gentlemen could not well avoid knowing all these things, and yet have they been wholly unmindful of them. Indeed, a few are reported to have grown more furious under the just censures with which they have been visited. Will any man say now that these persons were not warring against their own country?—that they have not, morally speaking, joined the enemy? Well do we know the opinion and feelings of our own noble officers and soldiers on this melancholy subject. The speech of the heroic Doniphan at St. Louis, last summer, the recent statements of Wynkoop and Morgan, which we have all read in the newspapers, have administered most damning proof against these mischievous and meddlesome haranguers, and will eventually consign them, one and all, if they shall not speedily exhibit satisfactory signs of a genuine repentance, to an infamy as undying as their offences, whilst unatoned for, are unpardonable, either upon earth or in heaven.

Hear what the heroic Colonel Burnet said the other day in Philadelphia, at a dinner given in honor of him:

"He (Colonel Burnet) could not refrain from thanking the company assembled for the compliment done his regiment and himself—that it did not exactly become him to speak of the policy of the war, but he would give some general views in regard to the feeling in Mexico, and that in order to prosecute the war with effect, we should be united as a people. [Three cheers.] Colonel Burnet said Santa Anna had prepared a document made up from speeches and editorials put forth in this country concerning the war, among which was the declaration of an American Senator that he would not vote for supplies. These things operated against us very much."

Let no man hereafter complain of the President; he told but the truth about this matter, and with a republican boldness and simplicity becoming his character and station. As our executive sentinel upon the watch-tower of the nation, he but imparted seasonable notice to his countrymen of the fierce dangers with which moral treason was rapidly encircling them. Had he not administered this warning, he would have proved himself as faithless as those whose treachery he has been censured for denouncing. I will not pursue this disagreeable subject further. I am pained at feeling it to be my duty to refer to it at all. But the denunciations which have been so lavishly poured forth upon the head of the President, even in this debate, in connection with this part of his executive conduct, has rendered it necessary that the whole truth should at last be told. I hope not to be misunderstood upon this delicate point; no one is more than myself an advocate for the utmost freedom of debate upon all public questions, consistent with the established rules of decorum and a due regard to the present safety and true honor of this great Republic. And if any one of the speakers alluded to can clearly make out the case for himself, that his country was really in the wrong, and in danger of getting more and more in the wrong in regard to this Mexican war; that his particular interposition was evidently needed in order to check the Government in a career of folly and madness in which it was fast rushing to destruction, as has been alleged; and that he did really interpose with the *bona fide* intention of rescuing the nation from infamy and danger, either actual or impending; why then, he may perchance escape condemnation for

what appears *prima facie* to be so very censurable. But wo be to them if they fail in their justificatory proof on this point; for I tell them, and all of them, that it were better that they should never have been born, or that, being born, they should have died in infancy, or that they should now have a millstone tied about their several necks and be cast into the bottomless sea, than to stand convicted before the present generation and all posterity of having joined, in soul and voice, with the enemies of their country. A distinguished citizen of Kentucky—a leader of the party opposed to the Administration—said, in a public speech delivered by him last summer in the city of Philadelphia, amidst the acclamations of patriotic thousands, that, "without now inquiring into the origin of the war, (I quote from memory, and hope not to do injustice,) it was the duty of every American citizen to give his head, his heart, and his hand to his country." The same gentleman, it is said, a short time before, in New Orleans, had expressed himself as being in favor of a vigorous prosecution of the war; spoke fiercely of vindicating the wrongs of his countrymen, and actually talked about going into battle himself, with the view of slaying a Mexican, or at the least taking one prisoner. This was all very deliberately and patriotically said, and contains the strongest rebuke upon the class of men to whom I have been referring that could well be imagined. I hope the distinguished statesman and sage of Ashland has not yet changed his mind about this matter; the spirit breathed by that gentleman during the last war, and which broke in thunder upon a certain son of New England, in the other wing of this Capitol, for daring to oppose the then pending war with Great Britain, when he told him that he polluted the very carpet upon which he was treading, was the true American spirit, and is known to have awakened a hearty response from every hill and valley of the Republic.

Mr. President, I do not feel that I hazard anything in asserting that if the pages of history, ancient and modern, shall be ransacked, it will be impossible to find a case precisely analogous to the one under consideration. In fact, the only attempt which I have seen made to justify by precedent, is the case of certain distinguished orators of Great Britain during our revolutionary war, vindicating the then colonies in Parliament, and struggling to put an end to a long course of oppression and violence, in which George the Third and his ministers had involved themselves. The inapplicability of this case to the one under examination is too obvious to need more than a bare suggestion. We were then, or our forefathers were, British subjects—fellow-subjects of those who defended us, and who only defended one portion of the British nation against the wanton aggressions of another. Now, I have not yet heard any one assert that Santa Anna, Ampudia, Canales, and their myrmidons were our fellow-citizens; though I have certainly often heard Mexico in this debate called a sister Republic. I suspect, that if gentlemen will look into this matter specially, they will find that, passing over the Athenian case alluded to, there is nothing that approximates to the conduct which I have been reprehending, in all republican history, except, perhaps, the single instance of opposition presented to Hannibal, touching the war which he had unauthorizedly and wickedly commenced with the Roman Republic. For, it will be recollected that Hannibal had, without consulting the Carthaginian Senate, by a deliberate breach of an existing treaty between Carthage and Rome, suddenly crossed the Iberus, pushed his vast army through Gaul, and over the Alpine heights, and precipitated it down upon Italy, almost before any one either in Carthage or Rome knew that he had yet left Spain at all. Well, Hannibal, after a series of brilliant victories over the Roman armies opposed to him, despatched his brother to Carthage, to demand additional supplies of men and money from the Senate. That brother is reported by Livy to have thus expressed himself: "The nearer their prospect was of finishing 'the war, the more vigorous support of every kind 'ought to be afforded to Hannibal; for that it was 'carried on at a great distance from home, in the 'heart of the enemy's country. The consumption 'of money and corn was great; and so many en'gagements, while they ruined the Roman armies, 'had diminished in some degree those of the con'queror. It was, therefore, necessary to send a 'reinforcement, and likewise to send money for 'the pay, and corn for the maintenance of the 'troops, who had merited so highly of the Cartha'ginian nation."

In this moment of general exultation, it is said that Hanno, the chief of the faction opposed to Hannibal, though he knew the war to be unjust and unauthorized, and was full of anxiety as to its ultimate consequences to Carthage, acted with great dignity and composure; nor did he utter a syllable in opposition until, stung by certain sarcastic reflections which were cast upon him, he replied briefly in his own defence, and commenced his speech with these memorable words: "I should have remain'ed silent this day, lest, in a time of general joy, 'I might utter some expression tending to damp 'it." And after denouncing Hannibal and his unprincipled ambition at some length, he finally refused to vote supplies, expressly on the ground that Hannibal, who needed them, "had deluded his country with groundless hopes." Now, as I believe that a similar accusation cannot be justly preferred against General Scott in this case, who avows himself to be in need of the troops proposed by this bill to be sent to him, I beg leave here to observe, in addition, that whatever the necessity was at the time of General Scott's demand for aid, that necessity may have been greatly enhanced since he has been directly heard from, inasmuch as we have just learned that a proposition has been brought forward lately in the Mexican Congress, having in view the raising of forty thousand soldiers for immediate offensive operations. That I do not misunderstand General Scott's application for additional troops, will at once be obvious to all who will examine his letter, an extract of which has been read here, and runs thus: "Augment the 'army to fifty thousand men, to enable it to occupy 'at the same time nearly all the State capitals and 'the principal cities; to drive guerrillas and other 'robbing parties from the great highways of trade; 'to seize into our hands all the revenues of the 'country, internal as well as external, for the sup'port of the occupation, and to keep the Central 'Government in motion and alarm, until constrain'ed to sue for peace." And now, what say the Hannos of the American Senate? Why, they fiercely attack the whole arrangement for augmenting the army in Mexico; assert that no more

troops are needed; that General Scott has not actually requested reinforcements; and indirectly charge him with a scheme of annihilating the nationality of Mexico, though he expressly speaks of keeping the Government in *motion* and *alarm*, which, both among governments and men, I have always heard heretofore to imply vitality and capability of continued existence.

Mr. President, I listened to the speech of the honorable Senator from Delaware, [Mr. CLAYTON,] the other day, with feelings of unmixed surprise and mortification. The Senator commenced by denouncing our claim to territorial indemnity at the hands of Mexico as dishonest; and even charged us with an attempt to commit the vilest robbery upon our weak and defenceless neighbor. Being but a *novus hospes* within this Hall, I am not prepared to say whether such language is in strict accordance with what I hear so much talked about, in different circles, under the name of Senatorial usage; but I take leave to say, in reply, that, in the first place, my mind is not able to perceive the legal analogy between territorial indemnity obtained in a just and honorable war—for the recognition of which, I believe, the distinguished Senator himself voted, and also for supplies, both of men and money, to aid its prosecution—and a lawless attempt, by putting in bodily fear, to deprive an innocent and unoffending traveller on the highway—which was the case he cited—of his personal goods and chattels; and secondly, that the implication of dishonesty against all on this side of the Chamber, which his words conveyed—if they were not, indeed, intended to be meaningless—will not, I fear, be regarded by the public in general as entirely in keeping with the character which I am glad to learn that the honorable Senator has heretofore sustained for courtesy and high-breeding.

Mr. CLAYTON. Will the honorable Senator allow me to correct him? I think the Senator will bear me witness that I made no accusation of dishonesty against the Senator or his party. The Senator is entirely mistaken; I made no such charge.

Mr. FOOTE. The honorable Senator does not deny, still, that he brought the charge of robbery against the whole Democratic party, but says he intended no accusation of dishonesty. How he can reconcile the charge of robbery with perfect honesty of purpose, I leave to him to explain

Now, it is certain that where I reside, and in all the neighboring country, highway robbery is regarded as quite a serious affair, both against law and morals, insomuch that it is uniformly punished, when the perpetrator is detected and brought to justice, by death upon the scaffold. It would seem, though, that the Senator from Delaware has been accustomed to quite a different code of ethics, and that, in his judgment, robbery, or the taking away of personal goods and chattels, by violence, from the person of the owner, by putting him in serious bodily fear, may be in Delaware (I hope there is some mistake about this matter, though) a very creditable, virtuous, and praiseworthy act, and the robber himself may be altogether a decent and estimable gentleman. I know that Mr. Jefferson has charged upon Mr. Hamilton, that he entertained the opinion that it was quite possible for a man to be honest in private life, and yet practise gross corruption in his public capacity: but I belong to a class of politicians who believe that out of the heart of man are all the issues of life; that no honest and pure-minded man is either capable of stooping to the perpetration of iniquity himself, or of giving his sanction to it in others; and that corruption in a public man necessarily implies the existence of private dishonesty. But the honorable Senator disclaims any design of being personally offensive to any on this side of the Chamber; and with this explanation I am bound to be satisfied. I commend the Senator to a more circumspect employment, hereafter, of the terms of declamatory rhetoric.

The Senator from Delaware insists that the troops proposed to be raised by this bill are not necessary in Mexico; and, in support of this view, relates an anecdote relative to General Scott, which, it strikes me, was rather amusing in itself, and more humorously told, than calculated to reflect honor upon the commander-in-chief, whom I certainly hold in the most profound estimation. He says, that before General Scott went to Mexico at all, in conversation with friends here, he said, "Give me a column of five thousand American troops, and I will take the capital of the enemy, if it rains Mexicans for a week." I suspect there must be some mistake about this matter, as I have always understood, and have yet reason to believe, that he was supplied with a much larger force than five thousand men, at his own request; and that all the additional troops who have gone to him since have been sent because he stood in want of them.

Mr. CLAYTON. I wish to say to the honorable Senator that he misunderstands what I said. I did not say that General Scott had asserted that with four or five thousand men he could take the capital in a week, or within any other specified time. I did mention this, however—an anecdote, as the gentleman termed it: I said General Scott had stated, when speaking of the relative prowess of Mexicans and our own countrymen, that he did believe that with a single granite column—to use his own expression—of American soldiers, he could whip any Mexican force that could be brought against him, if it should rain Mexicans for a week.

Mr. FOOTE. The Senator from Delaware was pleased to read from a newspaper an account of some fifty thousand persons not belonging to the army proper, mere attendants upon its movements, who, he says, are actually about settling in Mexico, and who, with true Yankee enterprise, are already preparing to establish a railway from Vera Cruz to the city of the Aztecs, and intend also to supply the ancient capital of Montezuma with the blessing of the electric telegraph; and of these things the Senator most dolorously complains. Well, indeed I cannot join him in his solemn jeremiad; on the contrary, I had heard of all these things before, and had rejoiced over them exceedingly. I hope that American enterprise will shortly connect every city in Mexico by railways, and that the electric telegraph may speedily supply commercial communication between every important place of trade on the Pacific coast, and those ports which are located on the shores of the Atlantic.

He says, that if we send ten additional regiments there, they will never come back; the country is so very delightful, they will never leave it. Indeed, he says, "If you wish them to return, you will be cruelly disappointed; it will be like calling spirits from the vasty deep: they will not come when you do call them." Well, sir, if they do not come

back, because they shall have bettered their fortunes in Mexico, and find that they are more likely to live happily and prosperously there than in the United States, I shall certainly not bewail their new-found felicity; and if the spirits that the wizard Glendower was wont to call around him had at any time half as good an excuse for not obeying his summons, I am of opinion that he should have put up with the loss of their society without complaining.

The truth is, that I have suspected for a long while that Mexico was a sort of earthly paradise; and I hold in my hand a book, written by a person sustaining very particular relations with myself, in which I find this country described in the most glowing terms imaginable; and, by way of strengthening the suggestions of the Senator from Delaware as to its desirableness as a country hereafter to be settled by enterprising men of our own race, I will read the poetic description of Italy, by Goldsmith, which the author just alluded to has not hesitated to apply to Mexico:

"Whatever fruits in different climes are found,
That proudly rise, or humbly court the ground;
Whatever blooms in torrid tracks appear,
Whose bright succession decks the varied year;
Whatever sweets salute the northern sky,
With vernal tints that blossom but to die,—
These, here disporting, own the kindred soil,
Nor ask luxuriance from the planter's toil;
While sea-born gales their gelid wings expand,
To winnow fragrance round the smiling land."

The whole South will doubtless feel particularly grateful to the Senator for so seasonably and solemnly warning them against the dangers likely to arise to their peculiar domestic institutions from the annexation of Mexico. As the Senator from Delaware was one of those special friends of the South who voted for the Wilmot proviso last winter, it cannot be at all doubted that he occupies the very best possible attitude for assuming the guardianship of our peculiar local concerns. The honorable gentleman will forgive me, though, I trust, for exclaiming, in the name of one southern State, "*Timeo Danaos, et dona ferentes.*" With all due deference to the honorable Senator's judgment about the matter, sir, I am of opinion that it will be easy, in the event of any considerable acquisition of territory from Mexico hereafter, to reconcile all the local interests and feelings heretofore existing on the subject, upon principles which I may yet state before this session of Congress shall draw to a close.

Mr. CLAYTON. I voted for what is commonly called the Wilmot proviso, as my wish was to defeat the appropriation bill to which it was an amendment, by every means in my power.

Mr. FOOTE. The members of this body will not fail to recollect the imposing and exultant manner in which the Senator from Delaware paraded before us, towards the close of his speech, the celebrated resolutions of 1803, providing for a reseizure of "the place of deposit," as it was called at the time, in the island of Orleans, and supplying the President with an armed force to resist all future aggressions on the part of Spain. The resolutions, when amended, it seems, left out the proposition to seize violently "the place of deposit," and increased the military force proposed to be raised from "fifty" to "eighty thousand" "effective" men; yielding to the President full power, "whenever he should judge it expedient, to require of the Executives of the respective States to take effectual measures to organize, arm, and equip, according to law, and hold in readiness to march at a moment's warning," all these eighty thousand effective militia, "officers included;" and these resolutions, in their modified form, were enacted into a law, as I find, in a short time thereafter.

Now, what is the comment of the honorable Senator from Delaware upon this transaction? Why, he says—

"Did Mr. Jefferson raise an army to march upon and seize the territory, or to point our cannon into the windows of New Orleans, and thus provoke a conflict? Did any such spirit as that which seems to rage here with an unbridled fury, pervade the democracy of that day? No, sir—no, sir. The love of justice had not abandoned the American bosom. The honor of the American character was still dear to American statesmen. Thomas Jefferson, with his friends, dropped the proposition of Mr. Ross to seize on the country on the Mississippi, sent an envoy extraordinary to join Mr. Livingston in France, and they negotiated the celebrated treaty of 1803, by which Louisiana was ceded to this country for the sum of fifteen millions of dollars. Negotiation—treaty, (the Senator continues,) these were the means resorted to by the democracy of ancient days."

I have several observations to make on this part of the honorable Senator's speech, any one of which might, of itself, be deemed decisive; and first, in the case mentioned, Spain had neither invaded our territory, nor threatened to do so. She had only refused to permit us to continue in the enjoyment of a place of deposit for goods or produce, which our citizens upon the Mississippi and its tributaries might be inclined to land at any time upon the island of New Orleans, within her territory.

By the treaty of *friendship, limits,* and *navigation* of 1795, it had been solemnly agreed that his Catholic Majesty would permit the citizens of the United States, for the space of three years from the date thereof, "to deposit their merchandises and effects in the port of New Orleans, and to export them from thence without paying any other duty than a fair price for the hire of the stores;" and the King of Spain furthermore bound himself "either to continue this permission, (if he found, during the three years specified, that it was not prejudicial to the interests of Spain,) or, if he should not continue it, then to assign to said citizens of the United States, on another part of the banks of the Mississippi, an *equivalent establishment.*" On the 16th of October, 1802, Juan Ventura Morales, the Spanish Intendant of the Province of Louisiana, issued a decree, which, in violation of said treaty of 1795, prohibited the bringing in or depositing American merchandise within the limits of the city of New Orleans; and this decree was issued without assigning the "*equivalent establishment,*" mentioned in the treaty, elsewhere upon the banks of the Mississippi. Among the documents submitted by the President of the United States to Congress was one from William E. Hulings, some time before appointed vice consul of the United States at New Orleans, two from William C. C. Claiborne, Governor of the Mississippi Territory, and a third from James Garrard, the Governor of Kentucky. Mr. Hulings announces to the Governor of the Mississippi Territory the fact that the decree of the Spanish Intendant, already described, had been posted up in the city of New Orleans on the 18th of October; states that "the port of New Orleans is shut against foreign commerce, and not against foreign commerce only, but against the *American deposit* in this city. No mention is made," he says, "of any other place appointed for a deposit." Governor Claiborne's letters, one to the Spanish Intendant and the other to Mr. Madison, testify high indignation at the faithless conduct of the Spanish Government; and he says to the Secretary of State: "This late act of the Spanish Government at Orleans has excited considerable agitation at Natchez and its vicinity. It has inflicted a severe wound on the agricultural and commercial interests of this Territory, and will prove no less injurious to the whole western country." The Governor of Kentucky, in his communication to the President of the United States, under date November 30, 1802, says: "The citizens of this State are very much alarmed and agitated; as this measure of the Spanish Government will, if not altered, at one blow cut up the present and future prosperity of their best interests by the roots. To you, sir," he continues, "they naturally turn their eyes, and on your attention to this important subject their best hopes are fixed."

This, then, is the history of the affair. Mr. Jefferson says, in his annual message of 1803—anterior, of course, to the introduction of resolutions by Mr. Ross—"previously," (that is to say, previously to the period of excitement on the subject,) "a proposition had been authorized to negotiate for the purchase of Louisiana from Spain;" which proposition was then pending. Spain had some time before ceded to France the whole country then called Louisiana, but had not yet relinquished actual possession of the same. Whilst the temporary occupancy existed, the right of deposit was discontinued by Spain, which she had a clear right to do under the treaty of 1795; but she had failed to "assign the equivalent establishment," as she was bound to do. This was hardly just cause for immediate hostilities; yet Congress authorized the creation of an extensive military establishment, and gave the fullest discretion to the President on the whole subject. No warlike movement, it is true, was immediately made by Mr. Jefferson. But why? Because he had then a negotiation pending with Napoleon (not with Spain at all) for the purchase of the whole country. The Senator from Delaware will now easily perceive, doubtless, that there was no necessity for "pointing our cannon at the windows of New Orleans" at all. The honorable Senator will scarcely now contend that there is really any analogy between the two cases under review. But he will allow me to tell him, I trust, in a spirit of unalloyed kindness, that the number of errors which he has committed in connection with this affair is really surprising. He appears to think that Ross's resolutions proposed to "seize on the country on the Mississippi." Why, this was not the case. They only proposed "to take immediate possession of such place or places in the said island or adjacent territory as the President might deem fit and convenient for the purpose of deposit." Nothing more. This, the Senator will see at once, by a reëxamination of the resolutions. And why was this proposed? Simply because the original "place of deposit" had been discontinued, and no equivalent establishment assigned. What the honorable Senator means by talking about pointing cannon at windows in New Orleans, I am not able to divine. He surely does not mean to cast censure upon the officers in command at Fort Brown. But it really looks very much like it. The Senator will not find it a very easy matter to fix the responsibility of pointing the cannon at windows in Matamoros upon the President or Secretary of War; for I am positively assured that no precise orders on this particular point ever emanated from Washington.

But what if I open to the Senator a fact or two more in regard to Mr. Jefferson and the Democratic party of that time, in order to enable him to appreciate the almost Jackson-like energy of that high-souled Executive? Spain publicly protested against the cession of Louisiana to the United States by France; and her citizens bordering on Louisiana and Mississippi had committed various aggressions upon our population.

Mr. Jefferson refers to these acts of violence in his annual message of 1805, thus:

"Inroads have been recently made into the territories of Orleans and the Mississippi. Our citizens have been seized, and their property plundered in the very ports of the former, which had been actually delivered up by Spain; and this by the regular officers and soldiers of that Government. I have, therefore, found it necessary at length to give orders to our troops on that frontier to be in readiness to protect our citizens, and to repel by arms any similar aggressions in future."

The Senator from Delaware has referred us to the pure times of Jeffersonian Democracy, and would have us to understand that Mr. Jefferson and the Democrats of his time were a particularly gentle and forbearing body of men, and that they especially evinced this temper and disposition towards Spain; and the Senator recommends, in a very solemn and imposing manner, to us of this generation, their example and precepts. He seems particularly struck with Mr. Jefferson's preferring, in the instance of Louisiana, negotiation to war—negotiation by which so much valuable territory was to be peaceably acquired. I am charmed to hear that the Senator would have been a territorial annexationist in 1803, had he acted then as a politician, and hope that he may yet abandon the no-territory ground upon which his party have now pitched their political tents for the campaign of 1848.

As the Senator from Delaware appears to be so much enamored of the charms of Jeffersonian Democracy, I will do myself the honor of calling his attention to the letter of Mr. Jefferson, written in 1807, to our minister, Mr. Bowdoin, in Paris, which appears to me to be strikingly marked with the true democratic spirit of that period:

"Never did a nation act with more perfidy or injustice than Spain has constantly practised against us; and if we have kept our hands off of her till now, it has been purely out of respect to France, and from the value we set on the friendship of France. We expect, therefore, from the friendship of the Emperor, that he will either compel Spain to do us justice, or abandon her to us. *We ask but one month to be in the city of Mexico.*"

I imagine that, by this time, the Senator from Delaware is getting a little tired of Jeffersonian Democracy. He will excuse me, though, I hope, for one more experiment upon his patience. In a letter written by Mr. Jefferson in 1785, to A. Stewart, Esq., he uses the following language:

"I learn from an expression in your letter, that the people of Kentucky think of separating, not only from Virginia, (in which they are right,) but also from the Confederacy. I own I should think this a most calamitous event, and such a one as every good citizen should set himself against. Our present federal limits are not too large for good government, nor will the increase of votes in Congress produce an ill effect. On the contrary, it will drown the little divisions still existing there. Our Confederacy must be viewed as the nest from which all America, North and South, is to be peopled. We should take care, too, not to think it for the interest of that great continent *to press too soon upon the Spaniards.* Those countries cannot be in better hands. My fear is, that they are too feeble to hold them till our population can be sufficiently advanced to gain it from them, *piece by piece. The navigation of the Mississippi we must have.* This is all we are, as yet, ready to receive."

Now, I will tell the Senator, that if he is a Jeffersonian Democrat, I am one too: and as such, I fully believe that our Confederacy "must be viewed as the nest from which all America, North and South, is to be peopled;" and I am decidedly in favor, with Mr. Jefferson, of getting fairly and honestly the whole continent, "piece by piece." And this I hold, moreover, to have been the doctrine of the Democratic party always heretofore; and the opposite, or no-territory ground, has been that of the Federalists of the olden time, and of their Whig successors since.

Mr. President, I think it must be acknowledged that this debate has been marked with peculiar rancor on the other side of the Chamber, and that

terms of scurrilous reproach have been freely indulged towards the President of the United States, equally derogatory to the dignity of this body, unfit to be applied to the first magistrate of this great nation, and entirely unmerited in point of fact. One gentleman has not hesitated openly to charge the Executive with falsehood in regard to his declaration of the objects of the war; which is nothing more than a coarse version of what is reported in a paper, which I hold in my hand, to have emanated from a distinguished Senator now in my eye, at Springfield, last September, about "pretexts, evasions, pretences, after-thoughts," &c., &c. Another gentleman charges falsehood by inuendo, and assumes, with something of peculiar grace, and certainly with more than the ordinary dramatic emphasis, to blush for the President. Another charges "dishonesty," "robbery," "pillage," and "murder;" another, "hypocrisy;" another, "a violation of the Constitution;" another, "the usurping of powers properly belonging to Congress." Now, if the President be half as guilty as he is accused by honorable Senators of being, he ought, for the honor of the country, to be immediately impeached; and I a little wonder, under all the circumstances, that a great Hastings affair has not been before now gotten up, considering the lusty menaces which we know to have been thundered forth in various quarters, and the pregnant fact, that at least one member of this body is reported to have already declared that he is impeachable. I wish distinguished Senators would recollect the wise requisition of the common law, that even jurors, who only determine the facts of the case, must be *majores omni exceptione;* and that Justice was by the ancients painted blind, in order to indicate that all who approached her sanctuary should do so free from all preconceived prejudice, and exempt from all exterior influence. I take the liberty of reminding honorable Senators, whilst indulging these suggestions, of one of the most imposing judicial scenes which is recorded in ancient annals—the trial of Lucius Cataline by the Roman Senate. The beautiful sentences with which Julius Cæsar commenced his noble speech on that occasion contain a maxim which I fear is almost too elevated for even this Christian generation: "*Omnes homines, qui de rebus dubiis consultant, ab odio, amicitia, ira, atque misericordia vacuos esse decet. Haud facile animus verum providet, ubi illa officiunt. Neque quisquam omnium lubidini simul et usui paruit. Ubi intenderis ingenium, valet. Si lubido possidet ea dominatur; animus nihil valet.*" Now, if certain menaces which we have all heard of in regard to grave proceedings elsewhere against the first magistrate of the nation, were as honestly announced as they have been indecently paraded before the country, there may be yet some possibility of illustrious Senators, when called on to perform a high judicial duty, with the Chief Justice of the United States presiding in this Chamber, either challenging themselves or being challenged by others, on the score of incompetency to discharge the highest functions belonging to the body. I hope to witness no such painful and perplexing predicament; but if it should occur, it would, perchance, not be without a salutary influence in the way of example.

Mr. President, before I conclude what I have to say upon this occasion, I feel called upon to notice, and, if possible, in some degree to counteract, certain views expressed a few days since by the venerable Senator from South Carolina; and, in doing so, I believe that he at least will not question my sincerity in declaring, that such is my high respect for his extraordinary powers of intellect, and his numerous virtues, it is to me most painful to differ with him in opinion on any great public question. It would certainly be my wish to remain silent, notwithstanding my dissent from his views, but that I shall be compelled by a sense of duty to vote in opposition to the honorable Senator's profound and ingenious reasonings; and if I fail to state sound and substantial grounds for doing so, I shall incur the risk of being misunderstood by the whole country.

I understand the Senator from South Carolina to oppose the measure under consideration, on the ground that no additional troops are necessary for the attainment of any legitimate object, or for any object heretofore avowed by the Executive. He argues that the conquest of the interior regions of Mexico has advanced so far, that, if the troops now there are not speedily withdrawn to what he calls a defensive line, we will incur the hazard of annihilating the nationality of Mexico, and of thus failing to obtain a treaty of peace at all, for want of a valid Government with which to conduct our future negotiations. Mr. President, I will not undertake to decide whether or not the Senator from South Carolina be right in supposing that Mexico is in such imminent danger of losing her nationality. This may or may not be the case. It is certain that those who are best acquainted with the precise condition of things in Mexico think otherwise. The President still continues to avow his warm desire and confident expectation that a treaty will yet be effected with the Mexican Government, which will be at the same time honorable to us and neither unjust nor ungenerous to our obstinate adversary; and such is my respect for his wisdom and thorough sincerity of heart, that I do not feel at liberty to refuse him any aid which I am capable of rendering for the eventual attainment of this long-sought object. General Scott, too, seems still to calculate upon an early pacification, and has just announced a most imposing, and as I think, most judicious plan, for bringing it about; and I have too high an esteem for him, also, both as a commander and a patriot, not to feel a most decided deference for his judgment about this matter. *Cui-libet credendum est in sua arte*, is as much a maxim in military affairs as in the concerns of civil life; and I freely acknowledge that the Commander-in-chief in Mexico, with his extensive experience as an officer, and his familiar acquaintance with the resources, devices, and present temper of the foe, is to be presumed to enjoy a peculiarly favorable opportunity of determining whether or not we will be at all likely to succeed in ultimately conquering a peace; and so long as he seems to testify a generous confidence in his being able eventually to accomplish that for which we have been so long struggling, I should as soon do anything else which might be calculated to put the honor of the country in danger as refuse to vote him supplies of men and money to any extent which may be judged necessary to the complete and early success of his military operations. I can never consent, for one, to withdraw our army to any merely defensive line, so long as any hope of

obtaining a treaty of peace may remain; nor will I consent to do so, so long as there may be a chance of practical pacification, of a nature to be relied on, independent of treaty, provided a treaty turn out to be unattainable. I cannot perceive any possible advantage which would be likely to accrue from the adoption of a defensive line; but, on the contrary, I behold manifold evils and inconveniences, too obvious in themselves, and too often insisted upon heretofore, in different forms, to need any special citation at this time. This defensive-line project seems to be with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, a perfect panacea for all the troubles of this Mexican war, in whatever stage of it we may be. Last winter, when General Taylor had only penetrated the States in the neighborhood of the Rio Grande, a withdrawal to a defensive line was earnestly recommended. Now we have attacked and captured the strong castle of San Juan de Ulua, taken Vera Cruz, Jalapa, Perote, Puebla, and Mexico, and are proceeding rapidly to seize all the remaining strong places, to possess ourselves of the public revenues, put down guerrilla warfare, and reduce the enemy to such straits as must infallibly render him in a short time altogether hopeless of being able to make further resistance; and the Senator from South Carolina, with a consistency which seems to bid proud defiance to everything like change of circumstances, is heard to exclaim, still more emphatically than before, "Why do you not fall back to my defensive line?" with this notable alteration, which the events of the last twelve months have been able alone to effect, that the honorable Senator does not find it convenient to tell us now where this same defensive line of his should run; and he proposes, therefore, to convoke a council of officers to settle this important point. A strange council this would be, by the by; as it would be composed necessarily of gentlemen, all of whom would infallibly and very promptly declare their opinion to be, that nothing on earth could be imagined more injudicious or perilous than the adoption of any defensive line whatsoever. I hope not to exhibit the appearance of dogmatism on this point; but, after the most diligent inquiries which I was capable of instituting, I feel authorized to assert my belief, that it would be exceedingly difficult, if it would not be impossible, to find in the whole army a single officer of respectably high grade, who would risk his reputation as a military man so far as to give his sanction to the adoption of the defensive line policy recommended by the honorable Senator. But, says the Senator from South Carolina, if you remain in the central portions of Mexico much longer, and especially if you increase the strength of your army there, you will break down the Central Government, and destroy the last vestiges of nationality. As I before observed, this may be so, or it may not be so; but no matter what may be the precise effect of remaining in Mexico, in regard to our own municipal condition there, I am of opinion, that as we marched into the country in order to achieve indemnity for the past, and security for the future, we never can honorably withdraw our troops until we obtain them both in the most unequivocal manner. And though it is true, as urged by a Senator on the other side of the Chamber, that we went to war for free trade and sailors' rights in 1812, and came out of it in 1815, without having secured either; notwithstanding, the delay of a few months, as we now know, through the instrumentality of the battle of New Orleans, would have given us all for which we assumed hostilities; yet I can see no sufficient reason in this melancholy example of national discredit, which should induce us now to yield to the triple counsels of the yet surviving sages who negotiated the treaty of Ghent, and who are at present so happily agreed in the policy of getting out of this war with Mexico by a resignation of all the objects for which it has been heretofore prosecuted; so far even as to strike down our national flag again without further ceremony, and confess, by implication at least, that we went to war unjustifiably, and have spilled blood and wasted treasure without even the appearance of decent pretence, much less of full justification.

The Senator from South Carolina thinks, though, that our remaining in Mexico may, by putting an end to Mexican nationality, effectually prevent our reception of indemnity and security, through the medium of a treaty of peace; inasmuch, as though one nation may make war, it requires two to make a peace. Here I differ with him again; it requires two to agree upon a peace by treaty; but whether we get a treaty by remaining in Mexico or not, we are certain, at any rate, of obtaining a practical pacification, accompanied with all we have demanded, and perchance more, whether Mexico shall have intermediately lost her nationality by our failure to retreat to a defensive line at a great distance from her capital, or shall have retained it.

The venerable Senator from South Carolina will permit me to remind him of the fact, that he was opposed to the invasion of Mexico last winter, at the point of Vera Cruz, in part at least, because he deemed the Castle of San Juan de Ulua impregnable, and not alone from a fear of destroying Mexican nationality; and this excessive fear as to the extent of injury which our inveterate enemy may happen to receive at our hands, I consider one of the most remarkable events in this age of misdirected philanthropy and "idle and masterly inactivity." Let me recur to the pages of classical history for a moment. Livy informs us, that when Scipio Africanus proposed to the Roman Senate to enter upon his scheme of invading Africa, the aged Fabius Maximus, always a remarkably cautious man, and in whom we may well suppose that the effluxion of years had greatly cooled the fervor and diminished the hopefulness of earlier days, opposed the scheme most stoutly, and even inveighed against Scipio as a rash, visionary, ambitious young man, who was willing to expose his country to unnecessary peril, in order to gratify his morbid and eager cravings after military fame. The noble old Roman—for still Roman he was, despite his fondness for "idle and masterly inactivity," in attempting to counteract the scheme of invasion—spoke of "the enormous 'expense of the undertaking; not a single harbor 'open to our fleet; no part of the country at peace 'with us; no state our ally; no king our friend; 'no room anywhere, either to stand or advance." Well, Fabius failed in his attempt to defeat the African expedition, as a greater than Fabius did last winter, in regard to the expedition to the coast of Mexico, whose complete success is now one of the most glorious pages of our history as a nation. Scipio sojourned for a few months in Sicily, as General Scott did at the island of Lobos last year;

and finally landed on the African coast and strided rapidly from victory to victory, overturning in his impetuous course several large armies under Syphax and Hasdrubal; and finally prepared to strike a fatal blow at the vitals of Carthaginian nationality. Now, what would have been the surprise of his own country, and the regret of all posterity, had Fabius Maximus, in this moment of exultation and hope, exclaimed in the Roman Senate-house, as we have heard in this debate, that he always had thought this expedition would end in misfortune, and that now it must be apparent to all, since Carthage was actually about to lose her nationality, and would be therefore unable to appoint commissioners after awhile to make a treaty of peace? This melancholy page in Roman annals has not descended to us; and the war with Carthage was ultimately closed on terms that the Romans themselves, so far as I have heard or believe, never complained of. There was no talk in the Roman Senate such as we have had here now, that to deprive Carthage of any portion of her territory, by way of indemnity, would be as bad as highway robbery, and that a treaty of peace even for that purpose would be a mere nullity, on account of its having been extorted by force; as more than one of the profound jurists on the other side of the Chamber have not hesitated to avow.

But the Senator from South Carolina takes what he calls "higher ground," and urges that if Mexican nationality be extinguished, we shall be forced in the end, either to fall back to his defensive line, or to do what he supposes to be much worse, either to incorporate all Mexico within our limits, or establish a provincial government there. I take issue with the Senator at once as to both these alternatives. I deny that, in the case he has stated, if it ever should occur, we should be forced either to *incorporate* Mexico and her whole people, Indians, negroes, half-breeds, and all, in the sense in which the Senator from South Carolina uses that term, or that we should be compelled to treat her as a *province*, in the Roman sense of that term; or that, not doing either of these things, we then should be compelled to fall back to a defensive line. I will discuss these points more fully after a while; but I desire, at first with great and heartfelt deference to the Senator's excellent memory, to set him right, if I can, in regard to certain points of Roman history, a correct understanding of which is, perhaps, material to this branch of the controversy. The following paragraphs of the honorable Senator's speech contain the errors which I suppose him to have committed:

"What is the object of a vigorous prosecution of the war? How can it be successful? I can see but one way of making it so, and that is by suppressing all resistance on the part of Mexico, overpowering and dispersing her army, and utterly overthrowing her Government. But if that should be done—if a vigorous prosecution of the war should lead to that result, how are we to obtain an honorable peace? With whom shall we treat for indemnity for the past and security for the future? War may be made by one party, but it requires two to make peace. If all authority is overthrown in Mexico, where will be the power of entering into negotiation and make peace? Our very success would defeat the possibility of making peace?

"In that case the war would not end in peace, but in conquest; not in negotiation, but in subjugation; and defeat, I repeat, the very object you aim to accomplish, and accomplish that which you disavow to be your intention, by destroying the separate existence of Mexico, overthrowing her nationality, and blotting out her name from the list of nations, instead of leaving her a free Republic, which the President has so earnestly expressed his desire to do. * * *

"The President is right. If the vigorous prosecution of the war should be successful, and the contingency on which he expects to make a treaty fails, there will be no retreat. Every argument against calling back the army and taking a defensive line will have double force, after having spent sixty millions of dollars, and acquired the possession of the whole of Mexico, and the interests in favor of keeping possession would be much more powerful then than now. The army itself will be larger; those who live by the war, the numerous contractors, the merchants, the sutlers, the speculators in land and mines, and all who are profiting directly or indirectly by its prosecution, will be adverse to retiring, and will swell the cry of holding on to our conquests. They constitute an immense body of vast influence, who are growing rich by what is impoverishing the rest of the country.

* * * * * * *

"That it would be contrary to the genius and character of our Government, and subversive of our free popular institutions, to hold Mexico as a subject province, is a proposition too clear for argument before a body so enlightened as the Senate. * * * * * *

"Let it not be said that Great Britain is an example to the contrary; that she holds provinces of vast extent and population, without materially impairing the liberty of the subject, or of exposing the Government to violence, anarchy, confusion, or corruption. It is so. But it must be attributed to the peculiar character of her Government. Of all governments that ever existed, of a free character, the British far transcends them all in one particular, and that is, its capacity to bear patronage without the evils usually incident to it. She can bear more, in proportion to population and wealth, than any government of that character that ever existed. I might even go further, and assert than despotism itself in its most absolute form. I will not undertake to explain why it is so. It will take me further from the course which I have prescribed for myself than I desire; but I will say, in a few words, that it results from the fact that her Executive and the House of Lords, (the conservative branches of her Government,) are both hereditary, while the other House of Parliament has a popular character. The Roman government exceeded the British in its capacity for conquest. No government ever did exist, and none probably ever will, which, in that particular, equalled it; but its capacity to hold conquered provinces in subjection was as nothing compared to that of Great Britain; and hence, when the Roman power passed beyond the limits of Italy, crossed the Adriatic, the Mediterranean, and the Alps, liberty fell prostrate; the Roman people became a rabble; corruption penetrated every department of the government; violence and anarchy ruled the day, and military despotism closed the scene. Now, on the contrary, we see England, with subject provinces of vastly greater territorial extent, and probably of not inferior population, (I have not compared them;) we see her, I repeat, going on without the personal liberty of the subject being materially impaired, or the government subject to violence or anarchy!"

Now, I shall not here stop to discuss the meaning of the term province. It is obvious that the Senator's view of the matter is, that the extension of territorial dominion by Rome had the effect of prostrating her liberties. I confess I never met with this opinion before. It is certainly not in Gibbon, or Niebuhr, nor do I think it can be found in the pages of any other philosophic historian who has written of that wonderful people. On the contrary, the freedom of Rome commenced with territorial conquests, grew and strengthened continually with further conquests, and never became very seriously impaired, until the god Terminus began to think of receding. "But though Terminus," says Gibbon, "had resisted the majesty of Jupiter, he submitted to the authority of the emperor Hadrian." The first emperor of Rome for the first time announced the no-territory policy to Roman ears; and accordingly, the same illustrious historian just quoted, says "the principal conquests of the Romans were achieved under the 'republic; and the emperors, for the most part, 'were satisfied with preserving those dominions 'which had been acquired by the policy of the 'Senate, the active emulation of the consuls, and 'the martial enthusiasm of the people. The seven 'first centuries were filled with a rapid succession

'of triumphs, but it was reserved for Augustus to 'relinquish the ambitious design of conquering the 'whole earth, and to introduce a spirit of modera-'tion into his councils."

The Senator from South Carolina was pleased to designate a period in Roman history as the commencement of the ruin of free institutions nearly four hundred years anterior to the age of the Antonines, selected by Mr. Gibbon as the beginning of the decline and fall of Roman power. He says: "As soon as the Roman power passed from Italy 'beyond the Adriatic on the one side, and the 'Alps on the other, and the Mediterranean, their 'liberty fell prostrate." Well, if the Senator is correct in this statement, Roman liberty perished before the five hundred and fiftieth year from the building of the city, and nearly two hundred years before the reign of Augustus; as Illyricum, beyond the Adriatic, was certainly subdued as early as the year five hundred and fifteen, *ab urbe condita;* Spain was conquered by Scipio in the year five hundred and forty-seven of the same era; and the Macedonian kingdom was overthrown, and all Greece delivered from the tyranny of Nabis about ten years later. To recognize Roman liberty as having been prostrated thus early, would be to take away from the honor of free institutions more than I am willing to do, and would inevitably cast a multitude of great names, heretofore associated with the career of Roman liberty, into a dim and dusky eclipse, which might be seriously dispiriting to the champions of freedom throughout the world.

The truth is, sir, that there never was a year when Rome was free that she was not advancing rapidly along the pathways of territorial conquest. Let me cursorily mention a few names of conquered and annexed peoples, who had fallen before the Roman power anterior to the period of prostration specified by the Senator from South Carolina; commencing with the Albans, we have, then, the Latines, the Sabines, the Fidenatians, the Falisciens, the Venetians, the Prenestines, the Campanians, the Samnites, the Hernicians, the Tiburtians, the Privernians, the Apulians, the Etruscans, the Umbrians, the Marcians, the Pelignians, the Equans, the Volsinians, the Lucanians, the Tarentines, the Bruttians, the Sallentines, the States of Sicily, Carthage, Spain, Sardinia, Corsica, the Ligurians, &c., &c., &c. How wonderful it must seem to the Senator from South Carolina, that Roman liberty was not prostrated much earlier, even than the date of its extinction which he has specified!

But I will not pursue this topic further; and, indeed, should not have discussed it at all, but for the apprehension which I felt, that the powerful argument of the honorable Senator from South Carolina on this point, going wholly unanswered, might have an effect upon the public mind more or less detrimental in its character.

If the Senator had ascribed the prostration of Roman liberty to her badly-balanced frame of government, into which "the most incongruous and antagonizing elements had found entrance, and maintained unceasing discord;" to her defective system of jurisprudence, which, until the days of Justinian, was confessedly one of the most imperfect ever known; to her want of the representative and confederative principles of government; to her want of trial by jury, and her want of the means of rapidly communicating intelligence from place to place of her extended empire; and had ended with asserting that corruption, the means of perpetrating which, had been supplied to some extent by a system of robbery and confiscation in foreign and remote regions, which is impossible in this country under our Constitution, had aided in this sad work, I should have concurred with him most heartily. But to give all these considerations the go-by, and ascribe the downfall of Roman freedom to a single cause, and that not the true one, strikes me to be hardly as practical as to settle the matter summarily, by repeating the language of poetry, and saying, with Byron—

"The Goth, the Christian, Time, War, Flood, and Fire,
Have dealt upon the seven hilled City's pride;
She saw her glories, star by star, expire,
And up the steep, barbarian monarchs ride,
Where her car climbed the Capitol."

But let us advance a little further in examination of the honorable Senator's view of the dangers likely to arise to our institutions from the incorporation or provincialization of Mexico; one of which he says we will have to do in a short time, if we do not come over to his defensive line theory. The complete denationalization of Mexico, he says, will bring us to the necessity of choice between these alternatives.

Admitting the denationalization of Mexico to be at hand, then I contend, that without falling back to a defensive line, and without establishing a provincial government, or the incorporation of her people, in their present condition at least, measures could yet be taken, without varying at all from the policy necessary to be pursued in order to ensure a vigorous prosecution of the war, and, indeed, in pursuance of the military occupation policy now promulged by General Scott, that would inevitably lead to the gradual civilization and Americanization of Mexico, and, possibly, to her eventual annexation to the Confederacy, when qualified for this honor. I am proposing nothing for present adoption; it would be presumptious in me to do so. The views which I am about to express are my own, and may be, for aught I know, in their entirety, confined to myself; nor is any other person, official or unofficial, at all responsible therefor. Though I am happy to believe, that they will be generally concurred in by those whom I represent here, and in the main, judging from their published views; by two distinguished citizens of my own State, whose high reputation for abilities, for moral worth, and profound acquaintance with this particular subject, will secure, for any opinions which they may be known to approve, the utmost respect from their countrymen. I allude to the late Governor of Mexico, General Quitman, and another personage, whose name, for certain delicate public reasons, I may not mention here, but who was once my predecessor on this floor, has since associated himself in deathless connection with the great principles of free trade, and who may well be recognized as the Cobden and Mansfield combined, of this Western World.

Thus premising, I proceed to declare, that if hereafter driven, by stress of circumstances, such as have been anticipated by the Senator from South Carolina, to despair altogether of the effectuation of a treaty with Mexico, and we should be forced to keep possession of the country, in spite of our willingness to surrender it to its own present inhabitants on fair and honorable terms, why, even then,

I should not unite with the Senator from South Carolina in the sentiments of profound hopelessness, to which he has given such eloquent expression in our midst; but should endeavor to educe as much good as practicable from what might be considered by many as only unmixed evil.

And upon some such plan as I will proceed now to suggest, I should hope still further to provide for the happiness and glory of our own country, and the ultimate diffusion and perpetuity of the great principles of civil and religious liberty. And,

1. After such a temporary occupancy of Mexico by our armies, as is now taking place, I would gradually prepare the country, State after State of it, for the reëstablishment of civil government, taking care, in due season, to introduce our invaluable territorial system—that noble nursery of State sovereignties—and to intrust the inhabitants of each territory, as soon as it might be deemed entirely safe to do so, with the indispensable power of self-government.

2. Whilst a temporary military occupation of Mexico might be deemed necessary, I would station detachments of troops at three prominent points in the interior—Orizaba, Mexico, and San Luis Potosi—with a view of giving protection to the three commercial points of Alvarado, Vera Cruz, and Tampico; thus securing the mining districts from encroachment from any quarter, and establishing peace and perfect social order throughout the whole extent of the region thus occupied.

3. The next step which would be advisable would be the introduction of our system of import duties, bringing with it the blessings of free trade to Mexico, for the first time, and all their civilizing and Americanizing influence. By this means, the commercial monopoly heretofore enjoyed by Great Britain would cease forever; our valuable agricultural and manufacturing products heretofore, to a great extent, prohibited, would find ready entrance into the country, and be seen to float quietly along all the channels of domestic trade; the beneficial effect of which, in a moral point of view, will be easily inferred by those who have given their attention, heretofore, to such considerations, and which will be found beautifully and powerfully illustrated by one of the most distinguished writers of the present day, in a speech delivered in the great city of Manchester, in the month of November last, an extract from which I beg leave to submit. Mr. Alison, the historian, on taking the chair at the Athenæum soirée, in Free Trade Hall, on the occasion referred to, after a few introductory remarks, thus expressed himself:

[Here Mr. Foote read from Mr. Alison's speech a considerable extract, and continued thus:]

4. *Our system of land laws.* There is ascertained to be an immense body of valuable public land in Mexico, heretofore unappropriated, there being, as I am assured, from twenty-five to thirty millions of acres of the richest lands in the world yet unoccupied in the State of Vera Cruz, and a proportionate quantity in most of the States which have not yet become densely peopled. By bestowing farms of moderate extent upon actual settlers, the whole country would soon become occupied by a population equal to any under the sun, in all that is necessary to good government and high social advancement.

5. There are resources in Mexico not necessary to be particularly specified, which might be conveniently and legitimately applied, after paying the present national debt, to general education purposes.

6. Religious toleration, heretofore prohibited, would now prevail, and every man be allowed to worship God according to his own conscience.

7. Our system of trial by jury would be sure very early to commend itself to respect and adoption.

8. These and other regulations which will occur to all astute minds at once, without suggestion, cannot but work wondrous effects in the next five or ten years. Eight years ago, he who is now speaking used the following language:

"Surely it would not have required a large amount of prophetic sagacity, fifty years ago, to have predicted, that if ever a struggle should occur between the Anglo-American population of North America, or rather of the United States, and that enervated and mongrel race, who have been described in the preceding chapters of this work, precisely such results as have taken place in Texas, in the progress of the war carried on there for independence and liberty, would be seen to arise. The mind of one who would not have anticipated such results, could not have formed any acquaintance with the brightest pages of ancient historic lore; nor have read, with soul on fire, of the imperishable glories of Marathon, and Platæa, and Salamis. Perhaps as little astuteness is necessary now to foresee that the period is not far remote, when Anglo-American heroes, and statesmen, and moralists—the descendants of those British colonists of whom we have just been reading, whose early settlements only dotted, here and there, for a few miles, the bleak and barren Atlantic coast of North America—will be seen, with the consent of good men and true of all nations, to bear 'forward and aloft, over the land and over the sea,' that very banner of moral regeneration spoken of in the first page of this work, until even 'amidst the murmurs of the Pacific sea,' and over the beautiful plains and valleys of eastern Mexico a voice shall be heard saying, '*There is no God but the God of truth, and justice, and brotherly kindness; and his favorites are the spreaders of knowledge, the practisers of virtue, and the heroic yet merciful chastisers of wicked men and nations.*'"

The scenes herein described have been, in part at least, realized; and they are destined to be still more fully realized, if we shall dare to do our duty, regardless of illiberal cavils and factious opposition.

In answer to the objections of the Senator from South Carolina, it has become necessary to take a short view of the character of the population at present in Mexico. There are said to be now about seven millions of people; their number having rather diminished than increased in the last ten years. Of these about four millions are, as they have been described by the Senator from South Carolina, Indians—who, though gentle in their manners, docile, obedient, orderly, and industrious in their habits, are yet nothing more than Indians in their capacity for exercising political rights. They live together in towns and villages, have property in common, and enforce their former tribal usages, except so far as they may be restrained by special law. They are cultivators of the soil exclusively, and constitute (with slight exceptions, if any) no part of the population of Mexico subject to do military service. They have not enjoyed political rights; in other words, they have not voted at elections, since 1833. Nor are they desirous of being allowed to do so. Whatever they may become in future, under judicious and humane regulations, such as we have applied to our Chickasaw, Choctaw, and Cherokee Indians, remains to be seen. In the present state of things, though, no man of sound practical intellect, I suppose, would think of intrusting them with all the rights of American citizenship. An experiment of this kind formerly tried in Mexico is known to have been a total failure.

Three millions remain to be disposed of. Of

these the military aristocracy, the twenty-two thousand office-holders, and their servile dependants, constitute perhaps a body of two hundred thousand. These, with a portion of the priesthood, and their dependants and servitors, are known as the aristocratic party.

The peons, or *villeins appendant*, as they may be called, are a mixed race, slaves in the most unfavorable sense of the word, and transferable with the soil which they till. They are said to number about seven or eight hundred thousand souls, and constitute the chief resource of the military aristocracy for recruiting their armies.

The negroes are too inconsiderable in point of numbers or influence to be entitled to any serious regard in this view of the Mexican people.

The remainder, in number more than two millions, are the puros or democrats of Mexico, the friends of republican institutions, always friendly to our people and government, and especially so in this war, as is provable by much and satisfactory evidence; far more friendly to us certainly than to their cruel oppressors, the military tyrants. The puros are the bone and sinew of the country, the most intelligent, virtuous, and orderly people in Mexico. They recognize us, and justly, as their deliverers, and are full of apprehension at the prospect of our surrendering them again to the cruel oppression from which they stand now released.

As the retention of Mexico by the United States, should we be forced to retain it, is objected to by some on the ground of the enormous expense likely to be attendant upon our doing so, I will here submit a few facts calculated to allay all fear on this point.

1st. It is estimated by our Secretary of the Treasury, in his annual report, that the domestic commerce between the States of this Confederacy amounts annually to the sum of $500,000,000. Upon the basis supplied by this estimate, when a general free-trade intercourse shall have been once established between the States of this Union and Mexico, this new branch of domestic trade would amount to $166,000,000. Of which, if we suppose the trade to Mexico to be $83,000,000, we have an increase of more than $82,000,000 complete. Under the control of British councils, and by the instrumentality of prohibitory and peculiar duties, many of our most valuable staples—such as flour, tobacco, manufactures of cotton, &c., have been heretofore excluded. This would be no longer the case were Mexico part of the Union.

2d. For our produce and manufactures, we should receive from Mexico—1. Their great staple exports, gold and silver. 2. Their other mineral products, derivable from mines almost wholly untouched, consisting of quicksilver, copper, and tin. 3. Their valuable woods, consisting of mahogany, &c. 4. Cochineal, logwood, and other dye-stuffs. 5. Coffee, cocoa, and wine, of a flavor equal almost to any in Europe. 6. Hides. 7. Tobacco, equal to the best Cuba tobacco. 8. Silk, of which there is a considerable quantity manufactured at present; and, under the fostering protection of free institutions, the quantity could not but be greatly enhanced in a short period of time. 9. Sugar, to the raising of which the greater part of Mexico is admirably adapted in point of soil and climate; and it is a fact, (not a little remarkable it is, too,) that though the State of Vera Cruz possesses native resources, as a planting region, but little inferior to the island of Cuba itself, until the landing of our army under General Scott, there was no loaf sugar to be found in the vicinage of the city of Vera Cruz, except what was most inconveniently and expensively brought there on the backs of mules, from the Pacific slope, a distance of four hundred miles.

3d. The quicksilver mines of Mexico have not been regularly worked; but enough is known of them to authorize the opinion that they are greatly the most valuable which have ever been discovered. The article of quicksilver, in consequence of its having been, to a great extent, monopolized by the Rothschilds, has lately reached a price in market which may well be deemed enormous. The opening of the mines of quicksilver under our supervision and direction would at once cheapen the article everywhere. The value of quicksilver as an *amalgam*, so indispensable as such in mining operations, is too well known to justify extended remark on this head.

4th. I feel bound to add, that without the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, which can never be fully and availably under our control, except as an incident to the annexation of Mexico low enough down to embrace it, we can hardly calculate upon retaining the permanent possession either of California or Oregon. The difficulty of reaching any place on the Pacific coast from the densely-settled portions of the United States, and the immense consumption of time now unavoidable in performing such a journey, seem to make it more than probable, as one sagacious and profound statesman of New England has already predicted as to Oregon, that at no distant day, if no canal or railway across the isthmus shall ever be effected, an independent State or States will be likely to spring up on the Pacific, which will claim and hold all the territory rightfully belonging to us in that part of the world. With the isthmus and a canal across it; all danger on this score would be effectually obviated. With the isthmus and a convenient commercial communication between the two great oceans, this Republic will at once become the greatest commercial nation in the world.

5th. Lastly. If we fall back to a defensive line, the military aristocrats will reorganize under the protection of Great Britain, or some other foreign Government, and then we shall have a war on our hands which will be interminable. The fact that Great Britain has long struggled to control the destinies of Mexico—that she is known to be quite jealous of our present prospects in that country—that Lord Palmerston has recently, in Parliament, thrown out very distinct intimations of a disposition to seize upon the whole of Mexico, as indemnity for certain debts due to British subjects—together with the striking fact that the British Government is said to be already in possession of the pass of Nicaragua, should solemnly admonish us not to withdraw our troops and evacuate the country too lightly, nor, in the emphatic language of the day, without having obtained complete indemnity for the past, and entire security for the future; by which I understand full indemnity in money or territory, and full security for ourselves and our posterity. I am satisfied, sir, for the present, with having presented this hypothetical view of the compensating advantages likely to arise from the annexation of Mexico, in case the obstinacy of that nation, encouraged as she has been from this country to continue the struggle of arms, should finally constrain us to take possession of all the country, and hold it forever.

Mr. CRITTENDEN. I have listened to the speech of the honorable gentleman who has taken his seat with all the attention which his own high character, and, if he will allow me to add, my regard for him, could inspire. In the course of his very animated and eloquent remarks, there was one passage which I regret; and I now rise simply for the purpose of recalling his attention to it, and making a single remark upon it. I allude to that part of the gentleman's remarks in which he alluded to Mr. Clay, in language too plain to be misunderstood, and described him as "a magnetizer," employing certain arts for the purpose of promoting certain pretensions to the Presidency, which the gentleman thought proper to attribute to him. Sir, Mr. Clay is now a private citizen—a man venerable for his age, and (I think I may say without fear of dissent from any gentleman) illustrious on account of his character and his public services. He is now unconnected with political life; and I submit to the honorable gentleman whether those considerations might not have protected him from such an allusion, and from such imputations as have been cast upon him?

Mr. FOOTE. If the honorable gentleman will allow me—

Mr. CRITTENDEN. In a moment, sir. I have had the honor of knowing Mr. Clay, and of calling him friend, and being called friend by him, for the last twenty-five years of my life. I think I know him, sir, and I think I can venture to assure my honorable friend from Mississippi, that there is no man in this country more incapable of the practice of any ignoble art than he is; and that he would not have the Presidency at the price of any such arts practised by him. To him the Presidency could add but little. He will adorn a bright page in the history of his country; and there, sir, when the passions and prejudices of party shall be hushed, his will indeed be held by all Americans, the

"Clarum et venerabile nomen"—

a name honorable and illustrious, which, combined with the names of his great and distinguished opponents, will, with their blended light, forever illuminate and illustrate the annals of our country. I regret, then, sir, that in the course of these animated remarks—and much, I know, escapes us in the heat of debate which we would willingly retract—a passage should have occurred which may perhaps be construed more seriously than it was meant. I think I can assure the gentleman, that whatever information he may have received to the contrary, Mr. Clay has practised no art—neither the art of the mesmerizer, nor of the magnetizer, nor of the politician, nor any art whatever—to promote his pretensions to the Presidency. The highest official station could add but little to him—but little to his name or fame. Office itself is comparatively an ignoble object of ambition. His has ever been the higher object of ambition, to serve his country, and be rewarded by his country's approbation. He is altogether incapable of any art to circumvent, or to obtain any object. I can assure the gentleman that he has practised no means whatever, that he, himself, in the exercise of his nicest judgment, would condemn; and I make this appeal in the most kind and respectful manner, in vindication of a private citizen, and my friend, now absent, and represented here by my honorable friend, [Mr. UNDERWOOD,] and, however unworthily, by myself.

Mr. FOOTE. I concur heartily in what has fallen from the Senator from Kentucky in praise of his distinguished friend. Even the Latin quotation applied to him has my cordial sanction. I will even go further, and supply a word to be found in the original, and which the Senator has accidentally omitted; and I will say, "*Clarum et venerabile nomen gentibus.*" For surely Mr. Clay is known most conspicuously to all the *nations* of earth. The Senator seems to be dissatisfied at my using the phrase "magnetic influence" in connection with Mr. Clay's present visit to Washington. Now, I must think, that if the Senator had duly considered the meaning of the phrase in question, he would have taken no offence. A magnet is a substance distinguished for a certain mysterious yet powerful influence, which may be called attractiveness. Magnetism is attractiveness, or, in the present more ascertained sense of the term, a subtle, ethereal, mysterious, incomprehensible, and irresistible influence, possessed by one substance over another, or by one man's spirit over the spirits and sensibilities of others; which enables the magnetizer, in the latter case, even without actual contact, physically speaking, to control the will and conduct of all who come within range of his influence. Now, I have heard a distinguished countryman of the honorable Senator, Dr. Buchanan, give instances of the exercise of this power by himself, Dr. Caldwell, and others, in certain towns and villages of Kentucky, exceedingly surprising. Had I charged Mr. Clay with coming to Washington, at this particular time, to electioneer for the Presidency—to solicit support from prominent politicans for this high place, or even to plead with his old friends not to abandon him, I should have talked very unworthily. But I did no such thing; I used the most delicate and respectful terms possible, and only suggested that his very presence here was calculated to operate with magnetic power. And cannot this be said with propriety? Does not this distinguished personage awaken a profound sensation wherever he chances to go? Did not the citizens of Philadelphia turn out to do him honor on a late occasion, without distinction of party?-and was not the crowd so great, and put under such powerful attraction by him, as almost to obstruct his progress along the streets? I have been once or twice placed under this influence, more or less, myself; and was delighted to join my fellow-citizens of Mississippi on one occasion in affording to Mr. Clay a hearty welcome when he visited our State. There is a charmfulness about the whole man very difficult to resist. He is an orator of most captivating powers, too, and a poet by nature. Even his person would suggest to a casual observer that "he does not belong to the roll of ordinary men." My opposition to Mr. Clay is strictly political; but it is most decided. And though I hope never to give personal offence to him or his friends by the use of discourteous language, as long as God permits me to live I expect to be strenuously opposed to his principles as a statesman, and his advancement to presidential honors. I would notify the Senator that the celebrated lecturer on electro-magnetism, Dr. Boynton, is now in the city, and he could not fail to derive both pleasure and instruction from his discourses.

Mr. CRITTENDEN. I am exceedingly gratified by the explanation of the honorable gentleman. I knew that his own generous feelings and sense of propriety would lead him to assure us that he meant nothing that was unbecoming or improper.